DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 434 PS 011 417

AUTHOR McAdoo, Harriette; McAdoo, John L.
TITLE Parent-Child Interaction and the Development of Racial Group Identity and Self Concepts of Preschool Children.
PUB DATE Mar 79
GRANT NIMH-1-R01-MH-25838-01
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (San Francisco, CA, March 15-18, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; Comparative Analysis; Discipline; Family (Sociological Unit); Middle Class; Nonverbal Communication; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parents; *Preschool Children; Racial Attitudes; Racial Differences; *Racial Identification; *Self Concept; Self Esteem; Verbal Communication; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Nurturance; *Parenting

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on three areas: (1) mother-child and father-child verbal and nonverbal interactions; (2) racial differences in parent-child interactions, children's self esteem and children's racial attitudes; and (3) relationships between parenting style and children's feelings of self-worth and racial preferences. Subjects were 40 black and 44 white volunteer intact, middle income, suburban families with a preschool child. Each family was rated as in Class I or Class II of the Hollingshead-Redlich Socioeconomic Status (SES) scale. Seven data collection instruments were used, three with parents and five with children. Five separate interviews were conducted with each family. Interviewers were matched with parents by race, sex, and SES. Among the findings, mother-father comparisons indicate that white fathers were more nurturant than white mothers on both verbal and nonverbal levels. Black mothers were higher than black fathers on nonverbal interactions. Child data show that the children as a group had positive self concepts and that self concept and race attitude were not related in either group. Intercorrelations of parenting style and child data reveal that black parents as a team were clearly either nurturant or restrictive. In white families fewer statistical relationships were found. Those found differed from black patterns. In all families, children initiated more interactions with verbally restrictive parents. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187434

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Parent-Child Interaction and the Development of Racial Group Identity and Self Concepts of Preschool Children

Harriette McAdoo, Ph.D. and John L. McAdoo, Ph.D.
Howard University University of Maryland

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Harriette McAdoo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS011417

Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development at San Francisco, March 15, 1979

This research focused on three areas: (1) the first was the examination of the mother-child and father-child verbal and nonverbal interactions, in middle income suburban black and white families; (2) the exploration of racial differences in parent-child interactions and in children's self-esteem and racial attitudes; and (3) the examination of the relationships between the parenting style, and their children's feelings of self-worth and racial preferences.

There were two main reasons for doing this study. The first was because very few studies have used economically stable black families as subjects. Usually a study on black families is conducted on poverty families and the results are generalized falsely to all black families, regardless of class.

The other rationale for this study was to do a race comparison between families who are from similar SES classes. The majority of comparative studies have been made between poor black and non-poor whites. The confounding of race and class has been ignored, and any differences found have often been attributed to race. To prevent such a bias, care was taken to match both racial groups on SES.

The subjects were 40 black and 44 white volunteer intact families, with a preschool child, who had a mean age of 5.58 years. Thirty-nine girls (20 black; 19 white) and 45 boys (20 black; 25 white) were included. All families lived in a suburban new town located in the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area. Each family was in Class I or Class II of the Hollingshead-Redlich SES scale. The families were rated on the father's educational and occupational level. Forty-six percent of the black and 65 percent of the white families were in Class I, the highest status level.

This research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, Grant #1 R01 MH 25838-01.

Occupational and educational levels were obtained from each family's self reports over four generations, in order to find their mobility patterns. Two-thirds of the subjects' fathers were born into working-class families and were mobile into their present SES status. More blacks (87 percent) than whites (67 percent) were upwardly mobile.

Seven data collection instruments were used, three with parents and five with the children: (1) Verbal parental interactions were collected using a procedure devised by Radin (1972); (2) nonverbal interactions were coded using a procedure designed to match the Radin categories; (3) background information was gathered from each parent separately. The instruments used with the children were: (4) William & Roberson's Preschool Racial Attitude Measure (PRAM); (5) the Clark's dolls procedure; (6) the Thomas Self Concept Values Test; and the (7) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, to give us a rough auditory IQ measure. The order of presentation was counterbalanced in two sessions.

Five separate interviews were conducted with each family. Interviewers were matched with the parent by race, sex, and SES, to control for the effect of the interviewer.

During the first interview both interviewers introduced the project, became acquainted with the child, and explained procedures for parents' confidentiality. Each family had the option of dropping out and having their tapes destroyed in their presence.

Data on verbal interactions were gathered during the second and third interview. Each parent was interviewed separately for an hour and a half. The parent was asked to have the child present during the session, because later in the session the parent and child would play a game together. The real source of data were the interactions that occurred between parent and

child, as the child became restless and the parent responded to him. At the same time, the interviewer was asking questions on family background and child rearing attitudes. The interactions between parent and child were tape recorded for later coding. The two consecutive 15-minute segments, with the most interactions were coded for verbal interaction scores of the parent. Two coders worked independently with an intercoder reliability of .92, and used Radin's 26 categories to code verbal interactions. Radin used factored analyses on the 26 categories and found seven factors that were combined into two categories: nurturance and restrictiveness.

Nurturant behavior on the part of the parent referred to warmth, meeting implicit and explicit needs of the child, reinforcing and motivating behaviors, and setting limits on behavior with explanation. Restrictive behaviors were: commanding without explanation, threats, and sharp verbal control of the child's behavior.

Whether the parent or the child initiated verbal interactions, the dyad was coded. Proportional nurturance and restrictiveness scores were obtained by dividing the total frequency separately into the nurturance and restrictive scores.

Nonverbal interactions were coded during the interview. At three different points on the protocal, a time grid was inserted to code the nonverbal interactions. After reading the appropriate question, the interviewer immediately began to code the nonverbal behavior, every 15 seconds, for a total of two minutes. Coder reliability was over .85. The five categories of nonverbal behavior were: tone of voice, physical touch, meeting implicit needs, explicit needs of the child, and no interaction. A ratio was obtained of the frequency of interaction types, divided by the number of 15 second intervals during which interactions occurred.

One week following the parent interviews the child was seen twice.

Racial preference was obtained with the PRAM and Clark's dolls tests. The PRAM consists of 24 short stories depicting a person positively or negatively. The child was asked to select from a picture of two which child the story was about. The Clark dolls test is the traditional procedure for preference and self identity.

Self concept scores were from the Thomas test, in which the child, using his own Polaroid picture, is asked how he feels about himself, and how significant others perceive him: his mother, father, teacher and peers. While some restrictions are built into these tests bipolar choices, the wide use and standardization of the tests, allowed us to compare our findings with earlier ones.

Results

The results are divided into three areas: (1) Mother-father comparisons within each race and across races; (2) child data within and between races; and (3) relationships between parents' styles and the child data.

On verbal interactions, the overwhelming pattern of all parents was of nurturance, regardless of sex of the parent, race, or mobility pattern. Black and white mothers and black fathers had almost identical mean scores. The white fathers stood out as exceptionally nurturant. They were seldom restrictive regardless of the sex of the child. In black families both parents were equally nurturant and the children initiated equally to both. The only parent differences were that the black mothers talked more to the child and gave more positive nonverbal responses than the black fathers. In white families, the fathers were more nurturant than the mothers on both verbal and nonverbal levels. The white child initiated talking equally with both parents.

On nonverbal interactions the patterns differed by race. Black mothers were higher than black fathers, and white fathers were higher than white mothers on positive nonverbal responses. White mothers interacted more frequently than all other groups.

Across races, both mothers looked very much alike on verbal and nonverbal actions. The only difference was the white mothers' more frequent use of nonverbal controls. Fathers were different, with whites talking more frequently and being more nurturant on both verbal and nonverbal levels. Both fathers interacted at the same level of frequency with their child.

More intercorrelations of verbal and nonverbal behavior were found in black families than white. Both black parents tended to be nurturant, but no relationship was found between spouses in whites. Nonverbally positive parents tended to be matched in both races.

The one outstanding pattern that was found in all families, was that children initiated more to verbally restrictive parents. Mothers who spoke frequently also tended to be restrictive.

In race attitudes bc. preference and self identity were obtained. Both black and white children made accurate race self identifications. However, significant differences were found in the expected direction on race preferences. White children had a strong pro-white preference, on both the stories and the dolls. Black children consistently preferred the black doll on positive choices. However, they showed more variability on their story choices. One-third had strong pro-black and one-third had strong pro-white preferences, while one-fourth had no preferences.

The children as a group had positive self concepts, and no race differences were found. They all felt that significant others valued them highly. Significant sex differences were found. The boys had higher self concept than the girls and also felt their fathers valued them more highly.

Self concept and race attitude were not related in either group. This could indicate that these variables are independent factors in the child's multidimensional concept of self. The intercorrelations of parenting style and child data were markedly different in each race group. Within each racial group, there was a differential impact of parenting style on child data. In the black family, the parents as a team were either clearly nurturant or restrictive. The black children with higher self concepts, more accurate self race identity, and high IQs were in families with nurturant mothers, married to men who were also nurturant. However father nurturance was not related to these variables. Physically positive mothers had children with strong pro-black orientations, while verbally and physically restrictive fathers had children with white orientations.

In white families, fewer relationships were found and these differed from black patterns. White fathers who spoke often had children with stronger father referent self concept and made accurate self identities. White children with lower self concepts had mothers who were physically negative. No relationships were found in white families between verbal parent style and race attitude or self concepts.

Discussion

The in-group orientation of white children was expected, because of the positive reinforcement they receive in the wider society. Meanwhile, the black child may receive conflicting messages about his race preferences. Race attitudes and self concepts were not found related in either group. All of the children tended to feel good about themselves, and were able to make correct self identifications regardless of their racial preference. A preference for one's own or another racial group can not accurately predict how one values oneself as a person.

One important racial difference found was the differential impact of interaction styles on self concept and racial attitudes. White children felt good or bad about themselves independent of their parents' interaction style. However, the black child may not often receive positive outside support. Therefore, parenting style of blacks may have greater impact on their self concepts and ability. Fortunately, both black parents in this sample were nurturant.

These data show the importance of programs that would let the black parents know of the unique importance they play in maintaining the role of a buffer of nonsupportive influences in his environment. The very similarity of nurturant patterns within both black and white families, when they are of the same SES level, challenges some of the stereotyped views of the black family as being punitive and restrictive. It points to the need for more wider-scale research, on black and other minority families, in which attempts are made to control the effect of race and economics upon parenting.

Table 1

Description of Sample by Race for Sex, SES, Education and Occupation of Parents, and Religion

Group		Black f	Black %	White f	White %	Total f	Total %
Sex							
Boys		20	50	19	43	45	54
Girls		20	50	25	57	39	46
Total		40	100	44	100	84	100
SES, present family							
Class I, Upper Class		18	46	29	56	47	56
Class II, Middle Class		22	54	15	34	37	44
Total		40	100	44	100	84	100
SES, self rating							
Middle Class		29	76	39	93	68	85
Working Class		9	24	3	7	12	15
Total		38	100	42	100	80	100
Mobility Pattern							
Born Middle Class		4	13	14	33	18	25
Born Working Class		27	87	28	67	55	75
Total		31	100	42	100	73	100
Education							
Mothers	MA or higher	8	21	7	17	15	19
	College degree	20	53	19	45	39	49
	2-yr college	1	3	5	12	6	8
	High School	9	24	11	26	20	25
	Total	38	101	42	100	80	101
Fathers	G, Prof. degree	16	40	27	65	43	52
	College degree	17	43	14	33	31	38
	Some college	7	17	1	2	8	10
	Total	40	100	42	100	82	100
Occupation							
Mothers	Exec, Prof.	6	15	18	41	24	29
	Manager	23	58	19	43	42	50
	Admin, semi prof	4	10	2	5	6	7
	Clerical, sec.	5	13	3	7	8	10
	Not work	2	5	2	5	4	5
	Total	40	100	44	101	84	101
Fathers	Exec, Prof.	7	20	24	56	31	39
	Manager	25	69	16	37	41	52
	Admin, semi prof	4	11	3	7	7	9
	Total	36	100	43	100	79	100
Religion	Protestant	34	92	19	43	53	65
	Catholic	3	8	11	25	14	17
	Jewish	-	-	14	32	14	17
	Total	37	100	44	100	81	99

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviation of Race Preference (PRAM, Dolls), Racial Self Identity, Racial Content of Self Portrait

Variable	Black M	Black SD	White M	White SD	t	df
Race Preference						
PRAM	12.00	7.36	19.05	4.98	5.14***	81
Dolls preference	3.10	2.97	1.14	2.97	3.51***	82
Race Self Identity						
Dolls	1.60	0.67	0.34	0.57	9.30***	82
Portrait, racial content	3.60	1.55	2.39	1.24	3.98***	82
Self Portrait						
Porter	10.59	4.25	11.05	3.62	0.51	74
Thematic content	6.28	1.91	6.93	1.70	1.67	82
Self Concept						
Thomas (4 ref.)	50.55	12.62	50.25	11.25	0.12	82
Thomas (5 ref.)	51.15	12.00	50.07	11.49	0.42	82
Reference Groups						
Self	52.75	10.01	50.81	10.93	0.83	82
Mother	51.90	12.34	51.58	11.62	0.08	82
Father	52.48	10.24	50.09	11.25	1.01	82
Teacher	51.48	10.49	49.66	9.47	0.83	82
Peers	48.08	14.58	49.82	10.03	0.64	82
IQ, PPVT	112.55	12.71	113.50	13.75	0.32	82
	N=40		N=44			

*** $p < .001$

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Fs of Race Attitudes, Self Concept, and IQ Scores by Sex of Child, SES, and Race

	Sex(A)	SES(B)	Race(C)	(AxB)	(AxC)	(BxC)	(AxBxC)
Race Preference							
PRAM	0.83	0.06	18.83***	0.47	1.26	0.01	3.00
Dolls preference	1.40	1.15	13.56***	0.06	0.10	0.45	1.39
Race Self Identification							
Dolls	0.41	0.04	71.70***	1.64	2.01	3.73	0.19
Portrait, race content	0.61	0.20	11.40***	0.99	1.97	0.71	0.00
Self Portrait	0.06	0.00	0.55	0.04	0.24	0.04	0.55
Thematic content	2.71	0.02	1.23	0.77	0.89	0.10	0.00
Self Concept							
Thomas (4 ref.)	3.62	0.11	0.04	0.34	0.10	1.67	1.17
Thomas (5 ref.)	3.33	0.00	0.14	0.32	0.03	1.72	1.71
Reference Groups							
Self	7.51**	0.40	0.32	0.06	0.78	1.72	1.20
Mother	2.19	0.09	0.00	0.11	0.23	1.55	0.05
Father	3.94*	0.54	0.55	0.00	0.11	2.76	1.48
Teacher	3.17	0.00	0.60	0.49	0.21	1.35	1.28
Peers	0.37	0.63	0.14	1.15	0.06	0.49	2.70
PPVT IQ	0.39	2.03	1.16	0.15	0.87	0.75	0.02

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 4

Intercorrelations of Race Attitudes, Self Concept, IQ Scores and Age

Black

PRAM	1													
Dolls Pref.	2	-.659***												
Dolls Self Id.	3	-.290*	.406**											
Self Portrait	4	-.172	.185	.286*										
SC, Thematic C.	5	-.288*	.108	.308*	.294*									
SC, Racial C.	6	-.456**	.410**	.187	.440**	.177								
Thomas SC (4 ref.)	7	-.113	.239	.583***	.273*	.159	.169							
Thomas SC (5 ref.)	8	-.080	.208	.596***	.315*	.178	.165	.977***						
Self	9	-.164	.208	.522***	.132	.170	.174	.824***	.797***					
Mother	10	-.131	.190	.521***	.351*	.258*	.226	.772***	.816***	.664***				
Father	11	-.059	.175	.523***	.464**	.252	.201	.767***	.871***	.566***	-.646***			
Teacher	12	-.090	.192	.432**	.215	.096	.187	.860***	.885***	.670***	.621***	.764***		
Peers	13	.070	.155	.506***	.199	.055	.013	.858***	.826***	.587***	.448**	.561***	.664***	
Age	14	-.142	.277*	.394**	.438**	.195	.329*	.192	.183	.085	.383**	.296*	.069	.037
IQ	15	-.048	-.040	.083	.297*	.006	.136	.360**	.349*	.114	.360*	.358**	.272*	.327*	.298*

White

PRAM	1													
Dolls Pref.	2	-.449***												
Dolls Self Id.	3	-.073	.192											
Self Portrait	4	-.147	-.226	-.223										
SC, Thematic C.	5	.396**	-.165	-.072	.157									
Sc, Racial C.	6	-.011	-.003	-.158	-.168	.009								
Thomas SC (4 ref.)	7	.097	-.006	-.050	-.023	-.091	-.232							
Thomas SC (5 ref.)	8	.069	.004	-.022	-.007	-.113	-.287*	.980***						
Self	9	.135	-.032	.031	.061	.024	-.376**	.866***	.895***					
Mother	10	-.006	-.005	.049	.064	-.183	-.296*	.896***	.928***	.802***				
Father	11	.046	.088	.024	-.049	-.068	-.327*	.789***	.880***	.816***	.793***			
Teacher	12	.029	-.005	-.013	-.140	-.045	-.058	.896***	.883***	.694***	.764***	.737***		
Peers	13	.075	-.005	-.156	.065	-.214	-.274*	.898***	.862***	.714***	.779***	.606***	.703***	
Age	14	-.171	.226	.483***	.048	-.101	-.089	.235	.248*	.229	.235	.232	.217	.194
IQ	15	.014	-.003	-.066	.221	.006	-.072	.392**	.354**	.339**	.300*	.181	-.369**	.408**	.017

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14

*p <.05; **p <.01; ***p <.001

Table 5

Means, SD and t of Comparison of Parents within Each Race of Verbal and Nonverbal Interactions Proportional Scores and Verbal Interaction Frequencies

Variable	Race	Parent	M	SD	t	df	p
Verbal Interaction							
Nurturance	Black	Mother	.73	.20	0.66	39	ns
		Father	.76	.20			
	White	Mother	.75	.21	2.56	43	.01
		Father	.83	.15			
Restrictive	Black	Mother	.27	.20	0.40	39	ns
		Father	.25	.20			
	White	Mother	.26	.21	2.58	43	.01
		Father	.17	.15			
Child Initiates	Black	Mother	.34	.21	0.82	39	ns
		Father	.31	.21			
	White	Mother	.40	.23	3.12	43	.003
		Father	.29	.18			
Frequency of Interaction	Black	Mother	47.15	26.81	2.41	39	.02
		Father	33.60	22.99			
	White	Mother	55.21	25.40	0.73	43	ns
		Father	59.30	31.63			
Nonverbal Interaction							
Positive	Black	Mother	.09	.20	2.22	39	.03
		Father	.03	.04			
	White	Mother	.07	.06	2.04	43	.05
		Father	.11	.13			
Negative	Black	Mother	.05	.16	1.31	39	ns
		Father	.02	.03			
	White	Mother	.05	.06	3.95	43	.0000
		Father	.02	.02			
Interaction Occurrences	Black	Mother	.30	.22	0.68	39	ns
		Father	.26	.16			
	White	Mother	.49	.25	3.78	43	.0000
		Father	.33	.15			

Table 6

t Test of Verbal and Nonverbal Interactions by Race

Variable		Race	M	SD	t	df	p
Verbal							
Father	Nurturant	Black	.76	.20	2.05	82	.04
		White	.83	.15			
	Restrictive	Black	.25	.20	2.29	82	.03
		White	.17	.15			
	Child Init.	Black	.31	.21	.52	82	ns
		White	.28	.18			
	Freq.	Black	33.60	23.00	4.22	82	.000
		White	59.30	31.63			
Mother	Nurturant	Black	.73	.20	0.31	82	ns
		White	.76	.21			
	Restrictive	Black	.27	.20	0.31	82	ns
		White	.26	.21			
	Child Init.	Black	.34	.21	1.21	82	ns
		White	.40	.23			
	Freq.	Black	47.15	26.81	1.41	82	ns
		White	55.20	25.40			
Nonverbal							
Father	Positive	Black	.03	.04	3.88	82	.000
		White	.11	.13			
	Negative	Black	.02	.03	.03	82	ns
		White	.02	.02			
	Freq.	Black	.26	.16	1.85	82	ns
		White	.33	.15			
Mother	Positive	Black	.09	.20	.85	82	ns
		White	.07	.06			
	Negative	Black	.05	.16	.08	82	ns
		White	.05	.06			
	Freq.	Black	.30	.22	3.70	82	.000
		White	.49	.25			

Table 7

Analysis of Variance Fs of Race by SES Difference on Verbal and Nonverbal Interactions

Parent	Source		Verbal Nurt.	Restric.	Child Int.	Freq.	
Father	Mob. Pat.	(A)	0.17	0.15	0.25	0.19	
	Race	(B)	2.28	3.37	0.10	13.94***	
	SES	(C)	1.65	0.81	0.51	0.00	
	AxB		3.64	2.95	0.24	0.08	
	AxC		0.29	0.19	2.30	3.26	
	BxC		0.71	0.20	0.87	1.14	
	AxBxC		0.96	0.61	0.12	0.12	(df=7,65)
Mother	Mob. Pat.	(A)	0.61	0.61	0.60	0.18	
	Race	(B)	0.61	0.61	0.61	1.43	
	SES	(C)	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	
	AxB		0.27	0.27	0.19	5.92**	
	AxC		0.79	0.79	0.75	0.41	
	BxC		0.68	0.68	0.00	0.80	
	AxBxC		0.12	0.12	1.63	0.01	(df=7,65)

**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Table 8

Intercorrelations of Parents' Verbal and Nonverbal Interactions by Race

Parent	Variable	Verbal: Fathers Nurt.	Rest.	Ch.I.	Freq.	Verbal: Mothers Nurt.	Rest.	Ch.I.	Freq.	Nonverbal: Fathers Posit	Neg.	Freq.	Nonverbal: Mothers Posit.	Neg.
Black														
Verbal														
Father	Nurt.													
	Rest.	-.950***												
	Ch.I.	-.633***	.571***											
	Freq.	-.053	.032	.143										
Mother	Nurt.	.313*	-.376**	-.154	.065									
	Rest.	-.313*	.376**	.154	.065	-1.000***								
	Ch.I.	.031	.015	.138	.196	-.598***	.598***							
	Freq.	.178	.235	.017	-.012	-.062	.062	-.101						
Nonverbal														
Father	Posit.	-.010	.033	.115	.494***	.070	-.070	.312*	-.063					
	Neg.	-.455**	.477***	.060	.069	.008	-.007	-.200	-.504***	.160				
	Freq.	-.142	.117	.273*	.253	.113	-.113	.067	.206	.149	.097			
Mother	Posit.	.165	-.180	.027	.196	.206	-.206	-.067	-.171	.230	.021	-.129		
	Neg.	.101	-.113	.003	-.052	.121	-.121	-.057	-.061	-.077	-.079	-.222	.704***	
	Freq.	.115	-.051	-.151	.041	.012	-.012	-.002	.064	.188	.182	-.161	.696***	.525***
White														
Verbal														
Father	Nurt.													
	Rest.	-.999***												
	Ch.I.	-.803***	.802***											
	Freq.	.086	-.087	-.056										
Mother	Nurt.	.201	-.203	-.204	-.208									
	Rest.	-.201	.203	.204	.208	-1.000***								
	Ch.I.	-.160	.163	.289*	-.004	-.777***	.086							
	Freq.	-.240	.236	.183	.153	.086	-.777**	.005						
Nonverbal														
Father	Posit.	-.055	.055	.006	.008	.101	-.101	-.182	-.029					
	Neg.	-.323**	.326**	.299*	.317*	-.278*	.278*	.109	.310*	-.009				
	Freq.	.232	-.231	-.210	.319*	.208	-.208	-.280*	-.201	.637***	.021			
Mother	Posit.	-.202	.197	.274*	-.188	.075	-.075*	.132	.341**	.254**	-.012	-.168		
	Neg.	-.368**	.368**	.190	.144	-.377**	.377*	.195	.460***	.174	.508***	-.143	.103	
	Freq.	-.070	.065	.140	-.223	.021	-.150	-.028	.292*	.282*	.234	.075	.385**	.394**

*p <.05; ** p <.01; *** p <.001

Table 9

Correlation of Black Parent Interaction and Race Attitude, Self Concept, and IQ

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Fathers Verbal Int.				Mothers Verbal Int.				Fathers Nonverbal Int.			Mothers Nonverbal Int.		
		Nurt	Rest	Ch.I.	Freq	Nurt	Rest	Ch.I.	Freq	Posit	Neg	Freq	Posit	Neg	Freq
PRAM	1	-.235	.262*	.134	.053	-.077	.077	-.069	.022	.089	.282*	.004	-.299*	-.182	-.120
Dolls Pref.	2	.225	-.271*	-.306*	-.007	.092	-.092	-.064	-.101	-.014	-.165	-.143	.157	.160	.019
Dolls Self Id.	3	.107	-.074	-.051	-.246	.282*	-.282*	-.192	-.064	.199	-.129	-.071	.132	.080	-.011
Self Portrait	4	.029	.016	.039	-.064	.027	-.027	-.051	.289*	.180	.030	.072	.150	.149	.154
SP, Thematic	5	-.321*	.305*	.285*	.059	-.117	.117	.029	.066	.053	.250	-.180	.175	.181	.097
SP, Racial C.	6	.313	-.259*	-.089	.369**	-.034	.034	.161	-.055	.198	-.184	.068	.260*	.004	.221
Thomas SC (4 ref)	7	-.010	.064	.052	-.166	.298*	-.298*	-.453**	.027	.006	.137	.027	.249	.082	.226
Thomas SC (5 ref)	8	-.032	.085	.063	-.163	.306*	-.306*	-.475***	.021	.046	.149	.044	.202	.020	.191
Reference: Self	9	-.122	.180	.183	-.153	.049	-.049	-.197	-.065	.074	.076	.039	.161	-.002	.179
Mother	10	-.055	.099	.157	-.012	.354**	-.354**	-.453**	.162	-.014	.146	.122	.153	-.014	.061
Father	11	-.032	.073	.043	-.126	.354**	-.354**	-.502***	.055	.064	.133	.060	.126	-.014	.093
Teacher	12	.097	-.053	.029	-.257	.281*	-.281*	-.407**	-.082	-.012	.044	-.088	.187	.047	.249
Peers	13	-.059	.099	-.040	-.143	.225	-.225	-.404**	.009	.127	.196	.065	.202	.056	.179
IQ	14	.013	-.009	.144	-.169	.408**	-.408**	-.321*	.361**	-.115	.086	.163	.205	.153	.142

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 10

Correlation of White Parent Interaction and Race Attitude, Self Concept, and IQ

PRAM	1	-.137	.135	-.015	.127	.107	-.107	-.211	.224	.104	.174	.035	-.012	.051	.102
Dolls Pref.	2	.081	-.081	.202	-.072	-.111	.111	.238	-.134	-.252*	-.085	-.214	-.009	-.139	-.138
Dolls Self Id.	3	-.189	.186	.284*	.113	-.169	.169	.211	-.045	.032	.075	-.052	.005	.010	-.049
Self Portrait	4	.276*	-.274*	-.577***	.133	.080	-.080	-.070	.013	-.095	-.036	-.067	-.162	-.034	-.290*
SP, Thematic	5	-.002	.001	-.150	.139	-.012	.012	-.071	.126	-.029	.116	-.033	.067	.181	-.006
SP, Racial C.	6	.046	-.053	.143	.083	.069	-.069	-.099	-.148	-.083	.196	.275*	-.112	.017	.181
Thomas SC (4 ref)	7	.124	-.113	-.067	-.017	.109	-.109	-.018	-.215	-.041	-.019	.080	-.021	-.308*	-.194
Thomas SC (5 ref)	8	.124	-.112	-.077	.088	.083	-.083	.011	-.185	-.072	.013	.053	-.020	-.303*	-.258*
Reference: Self	9	.034	-.024	-.012	.020	.154	-.154	.041	-.043	-.015	.052	-.116	.140	-.156	-.182
Mother	10	.088	-.078	-.084	.060	.106	-.106	-.027	-.111	-.164	.044	.004	.004	-.348**	-.256*
Father	11	.129	-.012	-.070	.279*	-.002	.002	.094	-.099	-.107	.104	.025	-.004	-.179	-.279*
Teacher	12	.126	-.116	-.045	.108	-.013	.013	.050	-.291*	-.006	.006	.230	-.046	-.298*	-.182
Peers	13	.143	-.134	-.120	-.077	.116	-.116	.011	-.253*	-.044	-.146	.032	-.122	-.337*	-.246*
IQ	14	.247	-.246	-.156	.069	.190	-.190	-.073	-.131	-.007	.026	.011	.043	-.130	.063

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Nurt	Rest	Ch.I.	Freq	Nurt	Rest	Ch.I.	Freq	Posit	Neg	Freq	Posit	Neg	Freq
	Fathers Verbal Int.				Mothers Verbal Int.				Fathers Nonverbal Int.			Mothers Nonverbal Int.		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$